

constructing its rejection, and with Rochkind et al. removed, Creswell et al. does not show all of the elements. Since the remaining reference does not teach or suggest all of the elements, the Patent Office has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the claims are allowable over the rejection of reference.


Applicant brought this to the Examiner's attention on 28 January 2003. The Examiner did not have the file at hand to verify the existence of the 1.131 declaration and requested that Applicant respond with reference to the 1.131 declaration. If requested, Applicant can resubmit the declaration, but does not do so at this time as the declaration should be within the file wrapper. If the Examiner would like a second copy of the declaration, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone so that the declaration may be faxed forthwith.

In light of the removal of the Rochkind et al reference, Applicant requests withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and claim allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:



Taylor M. Davenport
Registration No. 42,466
P.O. Box 1287
Cary, NC 27512
Telephone: (919) 654-4520

Date: February 12, 2003
Attorney Docket: 7000-155

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW TO:	
Examiner: <u>Boakva, Alexander</u> Art Unit: <u>2666</u> Fax: <u>703-872-9314</u>	
<u>Kelly Farrow</u>	_____ Name of Sender
<u>[Signature]</u>	_____ Signature
<u>2/12/03</u>	_____ Date of Transmission